CANUCK LAW

Reporting That You're Not Getting Elsewhere (Do Your Own Research To Verify)

NOVEMBER 5, 2018 BY RONNIE

Canada Should Leave The U.N. Entirely

CBC News

> CBC/Radio-Canada is a Canadian public broadcast service.

Watch on

(The U.S. leaving the UN Human Rights Council. The violators are ***part of*** the council)

Breitbart News

Watch on

(The Hungarian Foreign Minister defending “legal-only” migration)

CLICK HERE, for the main page of the United Nations (in English).

1. Previous Solutions Offered

A response that frequently comes up is for people to ask what to do about it. Instead of just constantly pointing out what is wrong, some constructive suggestions should be offered. This section contains a list of proposals that, if implemented, would benefit society. While the details may be difficult to implement, at least they are a starting point.

2. Reasons To Dump The UN

The main argument here is that Canada would be **MUCH** better off as a country if we left the United Nations, permanently. No deals, no special arrangements, no reform, just leave forever.

For the political junkies, take this to heart: traditional arguments of “left v.s. right” are no longer relevant. The choice we must face is the “globalist v.s. nationalist” one. Is Canada a sovereign nation, one that determines its own future, or is it a U.N. colony or puppet state? If Canada is to be a free and independent nation, then the U.N. is the last thing we need. Here are several reasons, each to be explored.

(1) The U.N. Articles are incompatible with free and sovereign nations.
(2) The U.N. destroys borders through political means.
(3) The U.N. destroys borders through *direct* means.
(4) The U.N. destroys national sovereignty
(5) The U.N. erodes individual cultures and societies.
(6) The U.N. has become a money pit, with the climate change scam
(7) The U.N. funds do not go where they are supposed to
(8) The U.N. “councils” are beyond hypocritical.
(9) The U.N. would just be a bigger version of the E.U.

Of course, this list could be much, MUCH longer. However, the point is to demonstrate that the U.N. is a globalist institution, and that it has no respect for individual nations.

(1) The U.N. Articles are incompatible with free and sovereign nations.

Click here, for the full text, but here are some worth noting:

> Article 8
> The United Nations shall place no restrictions on the **eligibility of men and women** to participate in any capacity and under conditions of equality in its principal and subsidiary organs.

This is a bit amusing, since many of its members do not believe in women’s rights.

> Article 19
> A Member of the United Nations which is in **arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly** if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding two full years. The General Assembly may, nevertheless, permit such a Member to vote if it is satisfied that the **failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the**

control of the Member.

No money, no vote. Sort of a pay-to-play system.

Article 24
In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its **Members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security,** and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf.
In discharging these duties the Security Council shall act in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations. The specific powers granted to the Security Council for the discharge of these duties are laid down in Chapters VI, VII, VIII, and XII.
The Security Council shall submit annual and, when necessary, special reports to the General Assembly for its consideration.

Article 25
The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter.

So, if 8 nations got together, they could override the nation's sovereignty. Great idea.

Article 32
Any Member of the United Nations **which is not a member of the Security Council or any state which is not a Member of the United Nations,** if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, shall be invited to participate, **without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute.** The Security Council shall lay down such conditions as it deems just for the participation of a state which is not a Member of the United Nations.

Yes, no joke, you won't even get a vote if you are not on the council.

Article 41
The **Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions,** and it may call upon the

> Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

> Article 42
> Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may **take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.** Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations

If this weren't the United Nations doing this, it would seem an awful lot like the mafia. There are more clauses, but the point here has been made. Signing on with the U.N. means losing control of your country.

(2) The U.N. destroys borders through political means.
This was addressed in an earlier article. The U.N. does try to push mass immigration (a.k.a. "open borders") on the rest of the world. The latest effort is the global compact for migration, which would effectively give the U.N. control over the host countries' borders.

Interestingly, the U.N. site has both a: compact for migration and a compact on refugees. However, the U.N. seems hell bent on pushing migrants.

(3) The U.N. destroys borders through *direct* means.
It is not enough for the U.N. to destroy borders with political means. The agency also directly aids and abets others, such as the Honduran migrant caravan. The U.N. openly admits helping to help thousands of economic migrants "illegally" get into the U.S.

And they admit it here.

> "IOM maintains its position that the human rights and basic needs of all migrants must be respected, **regardless of their migratory status,"** said Christopher Gascon, UN Migration's Chief of Mission in Mexico.

In other words, we don't care if they are illegal economic migrants. How is this not human

smuggling? Further, the U.N. has been known to help flood Europe with more than 1 million "refugees" since 2015.

(4) The U.N. destroys national sovereignty

Too many examples to cite, but here are a few from the U.N. website.

(a) If you think Trudeau is bad, gender neutral language is a serious thing here.

(b) The U.N. is big on stopping terrorism, but its efforts are seriously called into question considering how much it pushes migration.

(c) The Human Rights Council has ruled that the French burka ban is a human rights violation. Interestingly, the Council doesn't mention that being ***forced*** to wear it is a human right, or the security risk it poses is an issue.

(d) Of course, it wouldn't be complete without gender quotas.

(e) Here is some Trudeau style concern for ISIS terrorists.

(5) The U.N. erodes individual cultures and societies.

The U.N pages make many references to respecting religion and culture, particularly on the migration pages. Funny, they never mention ***assimilation***

Throughout its many sections on migration, the U.N. talks about how religions and cultures need to be respected, but notably absent is any expectation to respect the host country. Acceptance has to be a 2-way street.

(6) The U.N. has become a money pit, with the climate change scam

This was covered in a another article. The short story is that the U.N. is knowingly pushing a bogus climate change narrative, in order to extract large amounts of money, for "polluting" with carbon dioxide.

(7) The U.N. funds do not go where they are supposed to

There are many examples, but an infamous one was the oil for food program imposed on Iraq after the 1991 invasion of Kuwait. Under the scheme, Iraq could keep exporting oil, and the proceeds were supposed to help the citizenry. However, the program served

largely to enrich Saddam Hussein and his family, while leaving the population in poor conditions.

(8) The U.N. "councils" are beyond hypocritical.
This was alluded to in the video at the start.
Members with the worst human rights records are ***part of*** the Human Rights Council. See here for the 2018 list. The list includes: Afghanistan, Indonesia, Iraq, Libya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, U.A.E., and others

The U.N. Status of Women Council is just as big a joke. Their membership, elected for 4 year terms, includes: Algeria, Congo, Kenya, Iraq, Iran, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and others.

The Human Rights Council is filled with member states who don't believe in human rights. The Status of Women Council is filled with member states who don't believe women should have equal right. Kind of flies in the face of the U.N.'s own declarations.

(9) The U.N. would just be a bigger version of the E.U.
Where to start here. The E.U. triggered Article 7 of the Lisbon Treaty against both Hungary and Poland for rejecting "migrant quotas", which would strip them of their voting rights. Yes, Poland and Hungary might lose voting rights for daring to say that "they" will choose who lives in their own countries.

Italy has had its budget blocked by the EU. Yes, the democratically elected government needs to get approval of their own budget. Brexit was a rejection of E.U. controls, and Nigel Farage addresses it well.

While there are too many examples to cite, the point with #9, is that the European Union effectively destroys the sovereignty of the European States. The U.N. would just be a global example of the same problem.

3. Does The UN Serve Any Purpose?

I would argue, yes, to a point. However, we need to be concerned with our borders, and the sovereignty of our national policies. Becoming a province of the U.N. will only destroy Canada, as will flooding our borders with migrants (the U.N. doesn't pretend they are

refugees at times).

As for worthwhile causes, it would be better to decide for ourselves on a case by case basis whether to add any funding, or to send any personnel.

The battle for Canada will not be Left v. Right, or of Liberal v. Conservative, or of Poor v. Rich. It will be of Globalism v. Nationalism. As such, Canada should get the heck out of the U.N.

Canada for Canadians.

***SOLUTIONS*, CANADA, CANADIAN COMPARATIVE, CANADIAN POLICY IDEAS, CONSTITUTIONAL, ENVIRONMENTAL, FREE SPEECH, GLOBALISM, HUMAN RIGHTS, IDENTITY/RELIGION, IMMIGRATION (CANADA), TRANSPORTATION, VOTING PROCESS, WORLD**

2 Replies to “Canada Should Leave The U.N. Entirely”

slk1234

APRIL 29, 2021 AT 11:01 AM

How do we get out, a politiacian told me its not possible. How can I chat with you outside of this?

Grace

NOVEMBER 15, 2023 AT 12:29 PM

I disagree.

There is no redeeming quality to the UN. It is a reconstituted Nazi organization, and it has engaged in so much brutality and crimes against humanity, that any support for the UN is unjustifiable.